



SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Becca Neumann (Position #4 – Hydrologist), Co-chair

Joshua Morris (Position #7 – NGO), Co-Chair

Laura Keil (Position #10 – Get Engaged), Co-Chair

Julia Michalak (Position #1 – Wildlife Biologist) • **Falisha Kurji** (Position #3 – Natural Resource Agency)

Stuart Niven (Position #5 – Arborist – ISA) • **Hao Liang** (Position #6 – Landscape Architect – ISA)

David Baker (Position # 8 – Development) • **Blake Voorhees** (Position # 9 – Realtor)

Jessica Hernandez (Position #11 – Environmental Justice) • **Jessica Jones** (Position # 12 – Public Health)

Lia Hall (Position #13 – Community/Neighborhood)

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

Meeting notes

January 18, 2022, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Via Webex call

(206) 207-1700

Meeting number: 2483 113 5842

Meeting password: 1234

In-person meeting are not being held at this time due to the pandemic. Meeting participation is limited to access by joining the meeting through a computer or telephone conference line.

Attending

Commissioners

Josh Morris – Co-Chair

Becca Neumann – Co-Chair

Julia Michalak

Hao Liang

Stuart Niven

Lia Hall

Staff

Patti Bakker – OSE

Sharon Lerman – OSE

Kristin Brown – OSE

Marco Lowe – Mayor’s Office

Kye Lee – Mayor’s Office

Absent- Excused

Falisha Kurji

David Baker

Blake Voorhees

Laura Keil

Jessica Hernandez

Jessica Jones

Guests

Councilmember Strauss

Toby Thaler

Naomi Lewis

Public

Jim Davis

Steve Zemke

Sandy Shettler

Andrea Starbird

Taylor Duke

Aliesha Ruiz

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <https://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocuments>

Call to order: Becca called the meeting to order and offered a land acknowledgement.

Public comment:

Jim Davis noted that he is excited to see updates on the number of large trees and tree groves. He referenced the number large trees and tree groves reported in the 2016 canopy assessment report and is curious how that has changed.

Steve Zemke commented on a couple of bills the state legislature is considering. House Bill (HB) 1078 would override the work the UFC is trying to do with the tree protection ordinance; it would require that any city with a tree protection ordinance allow for any tree protection or mitigation obligations imposed by the ordinance by satisfied through the use of a tree bank. This would allow for more trees to be cut and fees paid into a fund. He urges Commissioners to contact their legislators to speak against the bill. The second bill is HB 1181, with associated Senate Bill 5203, and relates to elements of comprehensive plans. They are trying to get urban and community forest added to what is included in land use elements. He reiterated it's important to follow what the state legislature is doing and also to contact City Council members to urge them to ensure that state mandates don't overrule what Seattle is trying to do to protect trees.

Sandy Shettler also commented on HB 1078, noting that it allow developers to make decisions on removing trees, and would override cities' rules on what trees can be removed on private property. She submitted comments to her legislators and wants more people to know about it.

Andrea Starbird noted that she and several other Arborists representing 28 companies have submitted a letter to the UFC and will also be submitting it to the Land Use Committee. The letter requests considering that there are many tree professionals who deeply care about the urban forest and would like to be able to participate in the ongoing conversations around tree code amendments. There are a lot of passionate people involved that these things are deeply impacting.

Taylor Duke noted that he worked with Andrea in gathering the input from Arborists in the city, and he hopes that they can help in the future. They are not against tree protection, and their businesses hinge on tree protection and tree care. They want to have a voice in what that looks like in the city moving forward.

Martha Baskin noted disappointment in David Moehring's not being reappointed to the Commission, adding that David is a real prize among architects and landscape planners for understanding the critical need for housing density and trees, and that he seems to have been targeted by others in the city who don't agree with that. Martha regrets the way the process unfolded and that the Commission has lost a good member.

Chair, Committees, and Coordinator report:

Patti noted that since the last meeting, David Baker's appointment to Position 8 was approved at the January 11 Land Use Committee meeting, and then confirmed at the full Council meeting on January 17. She and the Co-Chairs will meet with David Baker tomorrow for onboarding and introductions, and he will start attending meetings in February.

Josh welcomed Councilmember Strauss and members of the Mayor's Office staff to the meeting. He noted that he sent an invitation to members of the Land Use Committee to meet with a small group of Commissioners regarding the urban forest protection ordinance.

Councilmember Strauss chimed in to say he wanted to attend the meeting today to thank the UFC for the helpful letter on the Tree Service Provider Registration ordinance amendments. He also thanked the group of Arborists for their helpful input. He thinks there are ways to merge input and create a bill that works for everyone. He hopes that they can take up the tree ordinance in the month of February, possibly going into March. He noted that they intend to take the time needed to get that ordinance right, and he will not move without UFC input, but they will need to move quickly.

Lia shared that she has set up the Instagram account for the UFC and made the first post. She is sharing the hosting duties with Laura and Falisha. The hope is to get more community engagement through this social media outlet. Also, she and Josh will be attending the Rainier Beach Community Club meeting on February 8, to share about the UFC and provide an opportunity for questions and answers with the community there. Other Commissioners are welcome to join.

Canopy Cover Assessment presentation – Patti Bakker, OSE

Patti first framed the discussion by reviewing what we envision for our urban forest, which is a Seattle that is climate-resilient, with ample tree cover across the city (30%) that is equitably distributed, because trees deliver extraordinary benefits to our community. So we are working toward a more equitable, community-centered approach to increase climate resilience and achieve at least that 30 percent canopy coverage. And we do this because of the extraordinary benefits that trees deliver to our community, as critical infrastructure.

Patti shared the key takeaways from the data:

- We are slowly losing ground. We lost 255 acres of canopy (net) - this is as big as Green Lake and represents a relative decline of -1.7% over 2016 canopy.
- Loss is happening inequitably. Neighborhoods impacted by racial and economic injustice started with less canopy and lost more than the citywide average.
- In terms of land uses, residential and multifamily neighborhoods and Parks' natural areas saw the greatest net losses. These areas will need more investment, a strong regulatory framework, and partnerships with community to sustain and grow canopy.
- Climate change is making it harder for our trees, and at the same time making them more essential. Climate change brings new pests and diseases and increased watering and maintenance needs. At the same time, trees are critical climate infrastructure, protecting us from extreme heat and improving air quality.

Patti discussed the canopy cover assessment process and noted that the bulk of the datasets and maps have now been received, and the city team is working with the consultants to produce the final report.

Patti reviewed what we mean when we talk about net change in canopy, as processes where canopy loss and canopy gain happen concurrently over time. We lose canopy mainly through losing trees, and when those losses happen, they tend to be sudden; they happen as an event. And they have both immediate and long-lasting environmental and quality-of-life impacts and cannot be reversed. We also have canopy gains, in the form of new trees planted and existing trees growing larger. These gains accrue more gradually, over longer periods of time. They require continual tree care and maintenance in order to ensure that new canopy remains. They are not always visible or immediately detected, and they remain vulnerable to climate and other canopy impacts. The result of these concurrent processes is a new amount of canopy that is different from what we started with and reflects both those losses and those gains; we are left with a net change from what we started with.

Looking at the data behind our citywide net loss: in 2016, we had 15,279 acres of canopy. In the five years following that, we lost 1,790 acres of canopy. We also gained 1,534 acres of canopy during that time, leaving us with that net change of 255 acres lost.

The reasons for losses and gains vary by MU, but there are some reasons common across the areas:

We are losing canopy:

- Due to climate impacts, our summers are getting hotter and drier.
- Our aging trees are more susceptible to the drought conditions and increased pests we're experiencing.
- Trees sometimes need to be removed for large construction projects for infrastructure such as transportation and utilities.
- And the city grew substantially during this period.

And then gains come from:

- Trees being protected and cared for so that they grow and add canopy.
- New trees being planted.

Patti discussed management unit canopy data, noting that the consultants have now been able to pull out the right of way from the other units so that it is a separate management unit whose areas is exclusive of the other units. She defined what the management units are and shared a graph and table showing the distribution of the management units across the city.

Patti shared graphs and data showing the canopy and canopy change in all of the management units, and also more detailed information and reasons for losses and gains in four management unit areas: parks natural areas, neighborhood residential, developed parks and right of way.

Patti then reviewed the canopy analyses related to equity, starting with explaining how the city's environmental equity priority areas are delineated, using the Office of Planning and Community Development's Race and Social Equity (RSE) Composite Index. She described the process of analyzing the canopy data relative to the RSE Index disadvantage quintiles, and shared the results that the areas in the two highest disadvantage categories started with less tree canopy in 2016, which had 16% less canopy than the areas in the two lowest disadvantages categories. Further, the data shows that those areas of highest disadvantage saw a higher rate of loss during the time period 2016-2021, so that in 2021, the areas of higher disadvantage had 20% lower canopy than the areas in the two lowest categories of disadvantage.

The consultant produced maps of canopy data shown to the census block group level; these include a map of canopy cover as of 2021 and a map of relative canopy change. These maps have an overlay of a boundary that includes the area within the two categories of highest disadvantage. Initial review of the maps shows canopy gains in some areas, but canopy losses in more areas. Deeper analysis of the data in each census block group will be conducted to determine the story behind the relative canopy change in each area, and that will further inform the city's work in prioritizing equity priority neighborhoods.

Patti then covered climate impacts, as climate change is both increasing trees' importance to the community and increasing their vulnerability. Trees are both critical to the community's ability to combat and be resilient to climate change, and significantly impacted by the climate impacts we are already experiencing.

The consultants analyzed the 2020 King County Heat Watch Data in relation to the 2021 canopy cover and determined that a 5% increase in canopy resulted in 2 degrees cooler temperature. Given that we expect climate change to bring more heat waves and hotter temperatures, this reinforces that increasing canopy in low-canopy neighborhoods is a critical aspect of our long-term heat preparedness strategy. The consultants prepared a map of tree canopy at a hexagon scale across the city, where each hexagon is the scale of several

city blocks. They also prepared a map of the heat data at the same hexagon scale. Comparing these maps allows us to identify are temperature hotspots in neighborhoods where canopy is low and increasing canopy there can make a difference. This is another layer that the city can add to prioritizing efforts, in addition to the equity neighborhood mapping, that will help identify the neighborhoods to prioritize in canopy efforts.

Patti reviewed data from other canopy metrics, including total tree count and the number of trees in each management unit, and the evergreen to deciduous tree ratio. She also noted other canopy metrics that will be included in the final report, including:

- Location of large trees, those 30" DSH and higher
- Location of tree groves, defined as at least a half-acre with majority trees at least 12" DSH
- Canopy volume and surface area
- Mapping of areas of potential tree canopy. The consultants have mapped out four categories: those areas where canopy currently exists, areas that are currently other vegetation that could potentially be tree canopy, areas that are currently impervious surfaces that could potentially be tree canopy, and those areas that are not suitable for conversion to tree canopy such as buildings and roads.

The final report will include some recommendations stemming from the findings of the assessment, and also pulling from the body of work that staff and stakeholders have been working on. There are four general categories that are currently outlining thoughts around the recommendations:

- Do a lot more of what's working – Increase resources for activities like maintenance, street and park plantings, Trees for Neighborhoods.
- Keep focusing on equity – Develop a comprehensive plan for investment in the equitable distribution and resilience of the urban forest.
- Get real about climate change – we need plant more native trees and consider their sourcing to ensure maximum chance for survival into the future; we need to provide more maintenance funding to ensure care of trees that are facing more heat, less water, higher pest/disease susceptibility; and we need to focus on heat islands and neighborhood hotspots.
- Align housing production and tree preservation/planting strategies – we know that balanced tree protections are important to retain large trees while supporting housing growth. More land for housing production can work if we incorporate the necessary components into our updated tree protection ordinance.

The final steps for this process include:

- Refine the last analyses.
- Conduct additional stakeholder engagement.
- And work to develop the final report and make that available.

Questions and comments from Commissioners included:

- Noting that canopy volume data will also be important, since the canopy cover on its own misses some changes – a small tree planted could have the same area as a larger tree, but much less volume.
- It's important to consider the relativity of the changes within the equity priority areas – an area that started with a small number of trees shows a large percentage change if it loses just one tree. The percent change reflects the starting point of that area.
- There is a lot behind what is happening with our trees – Seattle has many native trees but also many non-native trees, and we are in a phase of observation, research and diagnosis. We need as many trees as possible and as many different varieties in our urban forest until we understand more what is good and bad and then be able to deal with it.
- A caution regarding discussing the aging status of our second-growth forest, and not wanting that to be an excuse for losing trees.

- Industrial areas also generally have some residential areas in them, and we should continue to restore and regenerate those areas with trees.
- It's not going to get cheaper and it's not going to get easier for us to protect and maintain our forest, so there's an urgency about doing this right now, as soon as possible.
- We are not growing our canopy in the way that we need to; we need a very big and ambitious effort in expanding our canopy, putting trees in places where they're not going to come into conflict in the future. We need a much bigger vision in terms of planting and expanding the canopy.
- What is the timeline for the final report?

Urban Forest Protection Ordinance next steps

The UFC adopted its most recent feedback on the status of the draft ordinance in January. Councilman Strauss provided the information earlier in the meeting on the expected timing for the ordinance to be addressed by the Land Use Committee in February, so the updated ordinance version could be available for review in early February. Josh recommended Commissioners hold space for review of the ordinance when it's available, as it will take a fair amount of analysis on the part of the UFC to do it justice. A subgroup of Commissioners can be identified via email, that can be ready to meet with Councilmembers or other folks, and to thoroughly review the ordinance.

Position 8 reappointment process letter

Josh started this discussion by noting that this topic is not at all in response to David Baker's qualifications or welcome as a new Commissioner in Position 8. He noted the excitement in meeting him and working with him on the Commission. This topic and this letter is, rather, an expression of concern over the process, which was far outside the standards and norms that the UFC has been accustomed to, and felt disrespectful to the currently serving Commissioner.

Josh walked through the draft letter he prepared, which notes the concern over the process and that it lends credence to unsubstantiated claims against an incumbent Commissioner, and that it fell short of the transparency and norms the UFC has been working towards as they think about equity, diversity and inclusion in UFC processes. The letter requests the UFC be informed of any conclusions of any investigations into the claims against David Moehring, or if no investigation was conducted, and explanation as to why, and also a detailed narrative on how the recruiting and selection process was conducted. This process spanned almost a year; the letter includes a timeline of events as known throughout the process. The letter first thanks David Moehring for his service, noting how well qualified he was, how much experience he has that specifically fit the position, and listing his achievements during his time with the Commission. The Commission's concerns with the process are then described.

Commissioners discussed the issues, concerns and the timeline, and made some additional edits to the letter. The clarification was made that this was not a removal of a sitting Commissioner, but rather the withdrawal of a reappointment. Without a quorum, and with more discussion pending on this issue, the letter was not finalized or adopted, and will be considered again at the next meeting.

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details, listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Public comment:

Steve Zemke weighed in on the Position 8 reappointment issue, noting that the person who raised the objection before the City Council was involved in a lawsuit with David Moehring and his neighbors, and that it's troubling that the objection was not investigated or discussed with David or others. He noted frustration that this allegation that was brought by a person aligned with the Master Builders and the allegation seems to be politically motivated.

Aliesha Ruiz noted that she doesn't feel like the UFC is getting the whole story and recommends Commissioners speak with David Moehring to get more details and the full story.

Toby Thaler commented to say that the other person to talk to about the reappointment issue would be the Chair of the Land Use Committee.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 PM.

Meeting Chat:

from Sharon Ricci to everyone: 3:14 PM

Of course!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:15 PM

I've had a chance to read the letter--very helpful, thank you! Looking forward to connecting and learning more.

from Sharon Ricci to everyone: 3:15 PM

"A tree bank is an area or areas designated by a community in which trees can be planted to compensate for the removal of trees to enable development elsewhere.

Any city or town that has or enacts an urban forestry ordinance must allow for any obligations for the protection and management of trees imposed by the ordinance to be satisfied by the use of a tree bank."

[https://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2023-](https://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2023-24/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/1078%20HBA%20LG%2023.pdf?q=20230118070725)

[24/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/1078%20HBA%20LG%2023.pdf?q=20230118070725](https://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2023-24/Pdf/Bill%20Reports/House/1078%20HBA%20LG%2023.pdf?q=20230118070725)

from Lee, Kye to everyone: 3:17 PM

Thanks, Josh!

from Joshua Morris to everyone: 3:19 PM

Thank you, CM Strauss!

from Naomi Lewis to everyone: 3:20 PM

naomi.lewis@seattle.gov

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:23 PM

Thank you Lia! That is such a breath of fresh air, looking forward to it.!!

from Julia Michalak She/Her to everyone: 3:31 PM

Some of those canopy loss and gain areas seem to be the same for both time periods (perhaps I'm not viewing it correctly). Is the 2021 loss/gain relative to 2016?

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:41 PM

Question re total (not net) loss in Residential Areas--1000 acres was previously mentioned but it looks like it's actually 870 acres?

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:43 PM

right of way tree canopy can extend onto neighborhood residential and vice-versa

from Jessica Dixon to everyone: 3:45 PM

what is a developed park?

Jessica: think Cal Anderson or Volunteer Park

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:46 PM

canopy loss is area in this analysis. Loss of large trees and replacement with new trees represents significant canopy volume lost. Is there a canopy volume analysis of loss and gain?

from Taylor Duke to everyone: 3:47 PM

It would be informative to see these canopy coverage acres as a percentage of total available area in each management zone - it seems this would better highlight the opportunities

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:49 PM

Is there any analysis of parking lot areas and trees?

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:49 PM

Agree with Steve's concern--we should highlight that this data goes down to 8 feet so a mature viburnum can potentially count the same as a hemlock

from Hao Liang to everyone: 3:51 PM

Agree with Tylor. My concern is how the changing of management units in relation to the tree planting/"cutting" opportunities

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 3:51 PM

What metrics were used to measure loss/gain? Is this by canopy area, volume or height? Also, was this done in exactly the same as 2016? Area is very different from volume when a 100ft fir tree may have a relatively small canopy area from above, but in terms of volume, massive compared to a small tree that could represent the same area!

from Becca Neumann to everyone: 3:52 PM

I believe this analysis is canopy area for anything 8ft or taller.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:53 PM

Yes thank you Stuart! This should be highlighted. I have a yard full of bushes and I'm sure it counted as a forest.

from Sharon Ricci to everyone: 3:54 PM

Thank you all for working on ensuring that the urban forest is managed for future generations. Must run to a 4pm meeting.

from James Davis to everyone: 3:55 PM

There will be a significant loss of trees next to Longfellow Creek - two to three groves of Evergreens at risk of removal.

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 3:56 PM

Thanks Becca, in this case, the study is deeply flawed and does NOT show the true loss of tree canopy volume and all of the related habitat and 'eco-services' which cannot be calculated once trees are removed, unless trees being removed have been documented, which we all know have not been, especially by SDCI. To repeat, a 100ft Douglas-fir tree which could very well 'only' have a canopy spread of 40ft but could have canopy from 8ft above grade, making an English laurel hedge that is 9ft all and 40ft wide, almost the same in terms of 'area' measured.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 3:56 PM

highest disadvantage area included industrial areas. Seems that a distinction needs to be made of lands in residential areas as to possible increased trees. canopy where people live versus other land uses.

from Dan Strauss to everyone: 3:57 PM

Thank you all for your work and involvement. I look forward to working with the commission over the next couple months.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 3:57 PM

Ironically, SDCI is in the process of approving the removal of 52 mature conifers 30 feet from Longfellow Creek for single family homes!

from Lia Hall to everyone: 3:58 PM

There are people living in industrial zones

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:00 PM

Great point Lia! Industrial areas are equally as important as any areas with less canopy adds more to the 'heat island effect'

from Jessica Dixon to everyone: 4:01 PM

Retaining existing canopy in these areas should be an imperative

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:01 PM

Industrial and Downtown land use zones are not in current ordinance or the draft SDCI draft ordinance update

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:02 PM

Trees cool each other--hope the strategy includes grouping of trees and groves instead of single specimen street trees which are extremely vulnerable and short-lived.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:06 PM

Thank you Stuart! This "replacement plan" is not based on science. We need to highlight this before it becomes a widespread urban myth.

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:08 PM
Tree count doesn't have ROW pulled out.

from Chris Gaul to everyone: 4:08 PM
I agree with Stuart's suggestions of entering an observation phase.

from James Davis to everyone: 4:08 PM
The last Urban Forestry Plan stated we had 4 million trees.

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:08 PM
Yes, I've read 4 million before

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:08 PM
trees and tree-like shrubs

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:08 PM
I also completely agree with Stuart's comments.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:11 PM
Areas where people live in industrial as distinct from industrial areas that people do not live in

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:13 PM
I just wanted to counter the claim that deciduous trees are reaching the end of their lifespan; with many species being non-native, we simply have no way of knowing how long they may live in this region as they have never existed here before!

from James Davis to everyone: 4:13 PM
It would be great to see the actual numbers of large trees left - 30 inches DBH and greater - for this discussion of a tree ordinance. Is it down to 5000, from 6,338?

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:14 PM
Native conifers could live for hundreds of years and there are plenty of examples of non-native deciduous trees that can live for hundreds of years in urban areas also; just look at Europe and Asia

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 4:14 PM
Re: Stuart note: Sycamores are urban hardy and live up to 500 years. BIG

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:14 PM
Look at exceptional trees as greater than 24' DBH as proposed in draft SDCI ordinance.

from Taylor Duke to everyone: 4:18 PM
^this, no brainer

from Jessica Dixon to everyone: 4:18 PM
Did the analysis look at canopy cover in ECAs?

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:20 PM
Any sense of when the final report will be delivered?

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:21 PM
Yes thank you providing all of this data for us

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:21 PM
Agree Lia, just noting difficult to plant trees in industrial areas and currently is not in Tree Ordinance. Urge it be added to new SDCI draft Urban Forest Protection Ordinance

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:21 PM
And, I presume that NO changes will be made to the draft tree protection ordinance update will be made until this is produced as surely the results must be considered and a main part of the update?!?!?

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:22 PM
(changes)

from Linda Mirelez-Huca to everyone: 4:22 PM
Patti, thanks for your hard work toward the final report. Julia, great point about making sure canopy efforts sync with urban development.

from Julia Michalak She/Her to everyone: 4:24 PM
Thank you Patti - that was a great presentation. Very informative.

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:24 PM
Got it thanks, Steve

from James Davis to everyone: 4:24 PM
2020 Urban Forest Management Plan, page 7: "Seattle has more than 4 million trees and a diversity of understudy plants." The sentence and footnote does not indicate "and tree like shrubs". This was very unfortunate as it made people think we have so many trees that what is the problem.

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:27 PM
May I request that the UFC writes a letter to request that the conclusions are a main focus of the update to the tree ordinance by SDCl, given the signifiant loss of canopy since 2016 which clearly makes the City-wide goal of 30% canopy cover? That is to say, to be blunt, 'we' cannot make changes to the tree code that add to the documented loss of canopy.

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:34 PM
The UFC meeting was April 20. The McVicars comment was also at the UFC.

from James Davis to everyone: 4:36 PM
Sorry, the reference to 4 million trees was in the first draft of the 2020 Urban Forest Management Plan. The Final does have "and tree like shrubs." Good.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:40 PM
City Commission website is out of date. Only lists 10 positions for Urban Forestry Commission on site when there are 13 positions. Indicates no vacancy when position 2 is vacant we were told at last UFC meeting and has Sandra Pinto de Bader as contact who has been replaced by Patti. Last week David Moehring was listed as having been appointed. Now corrected. see <https://www.seattle.gov/boards-and-commissions>

from Chris Gaul to everyone: 4:43 PM
has opposing views

from Sandy Shettler to everyone: 4:43 PM
McVicars commented at the beginning of the meeting to the UFC,, on 4-20-22 it was recorded. Stated that position #8 did not represent development interests and in fact was working against development.

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:43 PM
Or not reappointed for a secone term

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:43 PM
Is the quorum 7? I think we have 7 commisionners in the meeting

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:45 PM
Add "or be reeaaponted to a second term."

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:48 PM
Mayoral appointments also require City Council approval. City Council never voted on appointment.

from Lia Hall to everyone: 4:51 PM
I'm sorry my phone died when you were counting quorum. Here now

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:51 PM
Planning Commission deals with development Planning and works with OPCD (Dept. of Planning and Community Development)

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:54 PM
Welcome back Lia

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 4:54 PM
We missed you

from Hao Liang to everyone: 4:56 PM
http://clerk.seattle.gov/~archives/Ordinances/Ord_123052.pdf

from Steve Zemke to everyone: 4:57 PM
position includes architect which David Moehring is

from Aliesha Ruiz to everyone: 4:58 PM
Your are not listing the most important allegation that was mentioned during the hearing. I think that it is misleading.

from Aliesha Ruiz to everyone: 4:59 PM
I suggest you ask David directly.

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:00 PM

Please ask Aliesah what she means?

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:01 PM

Aliesha, sorry for misspelling your name

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:02 PM

Thank you Steve

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:02 PM

10 trees were removed when David proved 8 could have been saved while attaining the same lot coverage of building

from Toby Thaler to everyone: 5:02 PM

Steve Zemke's information is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:04 PM

Thanks Steve, this is the same I was going to share with the UFC as it is essential that we know the reason Mr McVickers called in out of spite and in doing so, broke his non-disclosure agreement, allegedly. David Moehring never raised this, at all.

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:05 PM

Thank you Toby. I completely agree!

from Stuart Niven to everyone: 5:06 PM

Thanks all

Public input: (see next page and posted notes):

From: Lori Holst <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 9:21 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Protect the Maple Leaf Mother Groves!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

One of the Maple Leaf Mother Groves, at 1211 NE 104th St, is at risk due to arborist report errors, poor site design, and lack of protection during construction. With thoughtful planning, the developer of this property can achieve maximum density while retaining these groves, a win-win for people and nature.

The Maple Leaf Mother Groves are 22 "super-groves" which span entire city blocks in the Maple Leaf neighborhood. The City defines "groves" as eight or more large (12 inch dbh or larger) trees whose canopies touch. In contrast, Mother Groves span most of the properties on their blocks, and function as intact native PNW ecosystems. Because trees in groves cool each other and share defense from disease through their root network, we can count on them to be the most resilient part of our entire urban forest! They are also reservoirs of biodiversity for iconic native species which rely on forests to survive, rather than single trees along streets or in front yards.

The two groves at 1211 NE 104th St form an important part of a Mother Grove. Their removal or damage could launch a cycle of decline leading to the loss of the entire block's grove. To preserve this amazing community resource, please ensure the following:

1. Require a new arborist report. The arborist report submitted by the developer lists only 13 trees, yet 20 trees grow on this site. The report also omits an entire grove of 13 western red cedars, which are shared with adjacent properties.

2. Request that the Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU) be built on the generous amount of land available near the proposed new home, rather than where it is currently planned in the cedar grove. Both tree groves are conveniently located on the periphery and small panhandle of the site, leaving a large buildable expanse!

3. Protect the groves during construction with rigid fencing. Currently only vinyl netting is required, which provides little protection for trees and is often moved. Construction damage to roots could send these verdant groves into a cycle of decline. If trees at the edge of the grove die, others within the grove often follow.

Climate change has brought Seattle hotter, dryer summers and stronger winter storms. The Maple Leaf Mother Groves provide the community with resilient reservoirs of cooling nature, benefitting both the community and our larger ecosystem. Please ensure they are protected and continue to thrive for the health and safety of future generations.

Thank you for protecting our most important resource in our region.

Sincerely,

Lori Holst

206-491-6337

Lori Holst

lrholst@hotmail.com

1127 N 198th St

Shoreline, Washington 98133

From: Benjamin Taylor <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2023 1:09 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Please Update Seattle's Tree Ordinance, Give more flexibility for DEVELOPERS

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Dear Mayor Harrel and Councilmembers,

Please DO NOT update the tree code of Seattle in a way that implements nonsense restrictions on development to save trees. For every tree we save in the city limits, we bulldoze three more outside the city limits or in exurbs to build the housing capacity our region so desperately needs. If you must redo the

tree code, please do so without restrictions that classify trees as significant based on DBH or species of tree. A good tree code relies on using the "right tree, right place" methodology employed by Forterra, not on high retention requirements that prevent builders from providing capacity on buildable lands or via infill development. Please work to develop a tree code that will allow for increased housing and homebuilding in Seattle. Our canopy coverage of ~28% is the best in the country, better than Portland and other cities who have seen canopy decreases since implementing more stringent requirements, and there is no reason to put retaining old trees over building new housing that we so desperately need.

Best,

Ben Taylor

Seattle Resident, 106 Florentia St 98109

Benjamin Taylor

bentaylor@gmail.com

106 Florentia St

Seattle, Washington 98109

From: Brooke Peterson <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2023 1:49 PM

To: Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: Save Our Trees!

Urban Forestry Commission Coordinator Urban Forestry Commission c/o Patti Bakker,

Please act to update Seattle's Tree Protection Ordinance. It's been 13 years since the Seattle City Council first urged the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) to update the ordinance. We appreciate the recent enactment by the Seattle City Council and Mayor to adopt registration of Tree Service Providers in the city as a first step. We also appreciate action finally by SDCI to release a more complete draft of an updated Tree Protection Ordinance.

We believe that Seattle needs to protect its existing trees while planting more trees in underserved areas with low tree canopy to address adverse climate impacts while also increasing affordable housing. It is not a question of one or the other. We need to do both.

Trees and the urban forest comprise vital green infrastructure needed to keep our city and people livable and healthy. Trees reduce air pollution, storm water runoff and climate impacts like heat island effects, while providing essential habitat for birds and other wildlife. They are important for the physical and mental health of our residents. A robust urban forest is critical for climate resilience and environmental equity.

Seattle's rapid growth and increased density combined with an outdated tree ordinance are reducing these beneficial effects as trees are removed without serious consideration of ways to incorporate more of them in the development. Unless exceptional there is no real effort to save them. And what replacement requirements were in the ordinance since 2001 appears to have seldom been enforced. It is urgent to act now to reduce this continued loss of existing trees, particularly large mature trees and tree groves. It is important to promote environmental equity by retaining as many trees as possible and replacing those removed for climate resiliency.

We support the following provisions in SDCI's draft ordinance.

1. Lowering the upper limit for exceptional trees to 24" Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) from 30" DBH.
2. Continuing protection for exceptional trees less than 24" DBH and tree groves and heritage trees
3. Defining any tree 6" DBH and larger that is not exceptional as a significant tree
4. Continuing prohibition on removal of trees 6" DBH and larger on undeveloped lots.
5. Requiring replacement of 12" DBH and larger trees removed by developers
6. Creating an in-lieu fee for developers to replace trees 12" DBH and larger that cannot be replaced on the development site.
7. Requiring in lieu fees be used to replace and maintain newly planted trees
8. Limiting removal of significant trees outside development to those less than 12" DBH
9. Protected trees and replaced trees are covered by a covenant for life of project

Here are key provisions that need to be added to the draft ordinance

1. Expand the existing Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) Tree Removal and Replacement Permit Program using the Accela database system to include SDCI to cover all significant trees 6" DBH and larger, and all exceptional trees, on private property in all land use zones, both during development and outside development.
2. Require SDCI submit quarterly reports to the Office of Sustainability and Environment on tree removal and replacement as required by other City Departments
3. Require 2-week public notice posting, as SDOT does on-site, and add online, of any 6" DBH and larger tree removal and replacement permit requests and keep posted on a lot for 1 week after removal
4. Require that tree replacement numbers increase with the size of the removed tree such that in 25 years or less they will reach equivalent canopy volume lost – either on site or pay a replacement fee that also increases with the size of the tree removed
5. All replacement in lieu fees and fines should go into a dedicated Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund (not SDCI budget or city general fund), that yearly reports on their budget to the City Council and Mayor.
6. Allow the Tree Replacement and Preservation Fund to also accept fines, donations, grants, purchase land, set up covenants and for educational purposes.
7. Require 5-year maintenance of replanted trees
8. Allow removal of no more than 2 Significant non-exceptional trees in 3 years per lot outside

development

9. Require developers throughout the total development process to maximize the retention of existing trees with adequate space for trees to grow and survive.
10. Require a Tree Inventory of all trees 6" DBH and larger and a Tree Landscaping Plan prior to any building permits being approved.
11. Extend ordinance to cover all land use zones, including Industrial, Downtown and Institutions
12. Keep requirement that all 6" DBH and larger trees be on site plans
13. Require tree replacement or in lieu fees by developers for trees removed 1 year prior to property purchase
14. Allow city certified inspectors to enter property if necessary to ascertain any illegal tree activity
15. Provide adequate funding in the budget to implement and enforce the updated ordinance
16. All trees related are protected trees and not subject to removal
17. Require removal of invasive plants, like ivy, from development sites

Brooke Peterson

bpeterson27@hotmail.com

3400 NE 110th St , #202

Seattle, Washington 98125

From: RICHARD E <climbwall@msn.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2023 12:31 PM

To: LEG_CouncilMembers <council@seattle.gov>; Harrell, Bruce <Bruce.Harrell@seattle.gov>; Bakker, Patricia <Patricia.Bakker@seattle.gov>

Subject: David Moehring, Urban Forestry Commission Member Reappointment

CAUTION: External Email

To the Honorable Seattle City Council, Council@seattle.gov

January 17, 2023

RE: David Moehring, Urban Forestry Commission Member Reappointment

From: Richard Ellison, MS Botany, climbwall@msn.com

I am a retired Plant Ecologist and community college Adjunct Professor who has been involved in advocating for the urban forest for decades.

I have had the honor of working with David Moehring in trying to preserve trees during the development process. Mr Moehring is a highly qualified, certified architect, who is a strong advocate for more dense affordable housing, but also a strong advocate for tree preservation.

Repeatedly he has reevaluated site designs that propose to remove healthy exceptional and significant trees, and by rearranging the structures on the lots, was able to show how both the desired sq ft of housing and tree retention could be easily attained.

However, due to heavy lobbying by the Master Builders Association, who refuse any more controls on how buildings are to be constructed, have obstructed his continued service to Seattle and the Urban Forestry Commission. Mr Moehring is exactly what the commission needs, a talented site designer and a tree advocate. It is an insult to our calls for environmental action for climate change and environmental justice that he is not being allowed to continue on the Commission.

While his reappointment letter from Mayor Harrell was in April 2022, the Land Use committee failed to act on their obligations within seven months, and was perhaps inappropriately delayed by the committee chair, likely under pressure from the Master Builders.

I look forward to the new commissioners trying their best to preserve healthy heritage, exceptional, significant, and wildlife trees throughout Seattle, and in the growth of new developments to create more affordable housing and all housing types.

Thank you,

Richard Ellison.